



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

engaged in research in the archives and knows what a stir Harden caused in official circles and how he impressed the audiences to which he lectured when he referred to a *mere rumor* that Herr von Ugron, the Austrian Minister at Belgrade, had been assassinated that day—with the remark, “I fear though that it is true.”¹

Heretofore the attempt to manufacture a cause of war out of the Prochaska affair which had its run in November and December, 1912, and out of the Palić affair in March, 1913, has received too little attention in the press outside of Central Europe. In each case, war was avoided only when Russia, backing down, advised Serbia and Montenegro to do likewise. Soon, thereafter, it was announced in each case that the “*rumors*” on which these “*incidents*” were based were “*unfounded*.”

Austria's part in the Albanian venture, the dramatic challenge of Count Tisza hurled at Russia in 1913, the suggestive parallel between Austrian and Prussian plans for the dismemberment of Russia in 1854 and later, the changed and, to some extent, bellicose attitude of Francis Joseph after the Treaty of Bukharest, all these things brought up by Doctor Goričar are now established facts. Count Tisza by his silence did help to bring on the war, but contrary to Doctor Goričar, we now know that he was silent because he himself opposed a military triumph and was won over only with difficulty. By silencing Magyar opposition, he presented them with a *fait accompli*. What Doctor Goričar writes about the German *casus belli*—the general Russian mobilization—will bear careful examination.

For the general reader, the book should prove to be a fascinating one. For the historian, its value lies primarily in that it gives the *clue* to many questions which the scientist may take up and follow along ground more firm than that of the propaganda journals of the Foreign Offices of Vienna and Berlin. Some discrepancies in dates and figures, as well as in cited quotations, have crept into the work where more accuracy in these particulars would have added to the undoubted value of the work.

The book will live. It is an important contribution. The War Party and particularly, Baron Conrad von Hoetzendorf, did wish for war—and they got it!

ROBERT JOSEPH KERNER,
University of Missouri.

The National Government of the United States. By EVERETT KIMBALL, Professor of Government in Smith College. (Ginn and Company. 1920. Pp. iv, 629.)

¹ See the *Neue Freie Presse*, November 11, 1912.

Teachers of government who are restlessly groping toward a new treatment of the introductory collegiate course will not find their problem answered in this carefully executed text. Professor Kimball follows a familiar path. Against the background of brief chapters on colonial origins and the drafting of the Constitution, which after all carry the perspectives back only to institutions already well-grown, he sets his hand to a task which is essentially descriptive. Through the omission of state and local government he gains space for elements of detail which distinguish his book in scope, although not in kind, from its predecessors.

Professor Kimball does not wholly disappoint the reasonable expectation that the text-books on government which come today from the press will record the undoubtedly growing interest in administration. A useful chapter is devoted to an analysis of certain fundamental elements in national administration. Has Professor Kimball gone as far as he might? The treatment given to the civil service (pp. 221-232) will serve partially to suggest the answer. Aside from a dubiously voiced paragraph on the possible establishment of a retirement system, Professor Kimball has not a word for many of the most acute present-day problems of personnel: for the question of the relative inducements, motives and morale of public and of private employment; of comparative salary levels; of positive programs of recruiting and training; of reclassification under way during 1919; of the momentous movement which is unionizing civil employees by hundreds of thousands. Surely it is as important to raise such considerations before the student as to direct his attention to the abortive attempt at civil service reform in 1871.

The concentration of attention on the national government is not without disadvantages in the mere description of functions. Professor Kimball does in fact make acknowledgment of the fact that our constitutional theory, to say nothing of countless informal administrative practices, does not, with minor exceptions, confer exclusive jurisdiction upon either national or state governments. One-fourth of his chapter upon the regulation of commerce is thus devoted to an analysis of the interpenetrations of state control. But Professor Kimball's method inevitably tends to obscure the fact that national, state, and often local governments are simultaneously at work in nearly every broad field of administration. "The Bureau of the Public Health Service," reads an item which the accidents of national administrative structure has brought between paragraphs on the Federal Farm Loan Board and the Coast Guard (p. 247), "conducts scientific investigations,

disseminates information, enforces national quarantine laws, and cares for sick and disabled seamen at twenty-two marine hospitals." Thus is dismissed the agency which, in its capacity of advisory general staff to state and local health departments, perhaps best illustrates the possibility, already extensively developed, of reconciling centralization of knowledge and the decentralization of execution through the collaboration of national and state services. Yet, in fairness to Professor Kimball, it should be added that even the text-books which treat national and state government within the same covers usually leave them as separate in the minds of the students. It is the result of making agencies rather than functions of government the primary categories of arrangement.

Professor Kimball makes a point of his extended quotations from the exact language of judicial decisions. In his relative inattention to the facts involved, one feels that he lessens what is in fact the chief value in the use of cases. It is significant that, however much one may quarrel with the "legalistic" approach to government, he tends to resort to cases when he attempts to treat its functions. Administration consists of innumerable concrete situations, related yet unique. It is in the decisions of courts alone that one readily finds the permanent record of such situations, with summaries of fact to which training has brought at least succinctness. Perhaps we shall some day make equally available other data with which even more realistically to envisage the problems and technique of the process of administration. In any event we shall be foolish if we do not, by a scrupulous insistence upon the facts which elicit each decision, make the citation of cases contribute to the wholesome impression that government is a stream of situations, in which constitutional law itself is a matter of times and seasons, of almost infinitely shaded practical judgments, of growth. The omission of dates from Professor Kimball's citations is the outward and visible sign of a relative neglect of this consideration.

The chapters upon the methods of Congress are outstanding for their teachable quality. If one criticises them at all, it will be because Professor Kimball does not choose to examine the methods, as yet barely hinted at in our text-books, whereby the enmeshed group life of the country, playing upon Congress, yields the realities of what we term representation.

ARTHUR W. MACMAHON,
Columbia University.